

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/720,546	11/24/2003	Timothy T. Wenzel	2000U035D1.US	4578
75	90 08/11/2004		EXAMINER	
Univation Technologies, LLC			HARLAN, ROBERT D	
Suite 1950 5555 San Felipe			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX		J	1713	
			DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/720,546	WENZEL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert D. Harlan	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	, ·					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers		/				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	, ,,,	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  1 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/720,546 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

#### DETAILED ACTION

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goode et al., Publication No. WO

Application/Control Number: 10/720,546

Art Unit: 1713

98/20045 (hereinafter "Goode"). Goode discloses a method for inhibiting build-up in a polymerization system during polymerization of an olefin monomer into a polyolefin comprising the introduction into the system an antifouling agent in an amount sufficient to inhibit polymer build-up. See Goode, Abstract; page 1, lines 4-7. Goode further discloses a method for olefin polymerization comprising the introduction of a catalyst (Ziegler-Natta, metallocenes, di-imine metal complexes) and a cocatalyst into a reaction See Goode, page 6, second full ¶ through page 18, second full  $\P$ . Goode further discloses an antifouling agent that can be used in the polymerization process. Goode, page 18, second full ¶ through page 24, first full Goode further discloses that the antifouling agent can ٩. be added as a gas, liquid or solid and antifouling agent can have at least one -OH functionality. See Goode, page 23, second full  $\P$ .

4. Although Goode does not explicitly state that any of the selected antifouling agents change phase at a temperature above the operating temperature and reducing the effectiveness of the polymerization catalyst to polymerize olefin(s), a person of ordinary skill in the art

Application/Control Number: 10/720,546

Art Unit: 1713

reading the disclosure of Goode as a whole would render the phase change and reduction of polymerization catalyst effectiveness limitations obvious. Such assertion can be gleaned from Goode based on the fact that the olefin polymerization temperatures range from about 0° C to about 200° C and Goode teaches that the antifouling agent can be added as solid. It necessarily flows from the polymerization process for preparing polyolefins without reactor bluid-up or sheeting as disclosed by Goode that by adding a solid anti-fouling agents under the polymerization temperatures range from about 0°C to about 200°C the solid anti-fouling agent will change phases reducing the effectiveness of the polymerization catalyst. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goode.

5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agapiou et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,140,432 (hereinafter "Agapiou"). Agapiou discloses a gas or slurry polymerization process that substantially reduces reactor fouling and sheeting in a gas or slurry polymerization process. See Agapiou, Abstract; col. 2, lines 1-26. Agapiou discloses several "surface modifiers"

Art Unit: 1713

that are organic compounds; the "surface modifiers" are liquids.

### Double Patenting

on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,174. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claimed subjected found in U.S. Patent No. 6,369,174 is a species of the broader disclosure found in the present claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/720,546

Art Unit: 1713

## Conclusion

- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert D. Harlan whose telephone number is (703) 306-5926. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10 AM 8 PM.
- 9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (703) 308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 306-3429 for regular communications and (703) 306-3429 for After Final communications.
- 10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1495.

Robert D. Harlan

Page 6

Examiner

Art Unit 1713

rdh

August 6, 2004